



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/733,161	12/08/2000	Cameron G. Rouns	BAL-36	2368
75	590 04/07/2004		EXAM	INER
Timothy A. Cassidy			LAM, ANN Y	
DORITY & MANNING, P.A. P. O. Box 1449			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Greenville, SC 29602			1641	
			DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/733,161	ROUNS ET AL.				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ann Y. Lam	1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFF f extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply on the later than three months after the mail.	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action: or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would local canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment				
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	s issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a) $oxtimes$ will not be entered or b) $[$ uld be rejected is provided below	will be entered and an or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-26</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	e Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:						
410 to 4		LONG V. LE PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600				
cy / now In !		04/05/04				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Becker teaches away from forming a balloon from the materials as claimed since Becker teaches forming the balloon from types of materials other than the type disclosed for forming the catheter shaft (i.e., Becker teaches forming the balloon from materials other than the types claimed by Applicant.) In response, Examiner reasserts that Onohara teaches that the same material used for forming the catheter shaft can be used for forming the balloon. Thus, Onohara provides the motivation for using the materials disclosed by Becker for forming the catheter shaft to also form the balloon. Applicant also argues that the catheters in the Miyata and Joh references are not gastrostomy feeding devices. In response, Examiner emphasizes that the references disclose the structures as claimed by Applicant and are capable of being used in the stomach. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)...